

**In re Daniel Cass Mills**  
Petitioner

Supreme Court No. M.R. 31068  
Commission No. 2021PR00099

**Synopsis of Hearing Board Report and Recommendation**  
(December 2022)

Petitioner seeks reinstatement of his license to practice law. In 2009, he was suspended for two years and until further order of the Court for engaging in the criminal acts of possessing and using cocaine and cannabis, which reflected adversely on his honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer. The Administrator did not object to the Petition for Reinstatement but requested that Petitioner, if reinstated, be required to comply with certain conditions. After considering the factors set forth in Supreme Court Rule 767 to determine Petitioner's rehabilitation, good character and current knowledge of the law, the Hearing Board recommended that the Petition for Reinstatement be granted, with conditions including treatment by a mental health professional, random substance testing, and oversight of Petitioner's practice.

**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD  
OF THE  
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION  
AND  
DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION**

In the Matter of:

**DANIEL CASS MILLS,**

Petitioner,

No. 6231139.

Supreme Court No. M.R. 31068

Commission No. 2021PR00099

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEARING BOARD**

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

In 2009, Petitioner was suspended for two years and until further order of the Court after he was found to have purchased, possessed, and used cocaine and cannabis while he was employed as an Assistant State's Attorney. He now seeks reinstatement. We find he has met his burden of establishing that he is rehabilitated and meets the requirements for reinstatement. Consequently, we recommend that his Petition for Reinstatement be granted, subject to conditions.

INTRODUCTION

The hearing in this matter was held by video conference on June 16, 2022, before a Panel of the Hearing Board consisting of Sonni Choi Williams, Chair, Laura K. Beasley, and Daniel G. Samo. Petitioner was present and was represented by Carl R. Draper. Rachel C. Miller and Tammy L. Evans represented the Administrator.

PETITION AND RESPONSE

In 2009, Petitioner was suspended for two years and until further order of the Court. In re Mills, 07 SH 2, M.R. 23070 (May 18, 2009). Petitioner filed a Petition for Reinstatement on

**FILED**

December 02, 2022

**ARDC CLERK**

December 7, 2021. The Administrator does not object to the Petition for Reinstatement but filed a Response requesting that reinstatement, if granted, be subject to conditions.

### EVIDENCE

Petitioner testified on his own behalf and presented testimony from four witnesses. Petitioner's Exhibits 1 and 2 were admitted into evidence. (Tr. 127, 146). The Administrator did not call witnesses or submit exhibits.

### FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

An attorney seeking reinstatement to the practice of law bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that he or she meets the requirements for reinstatement. In re Richman, 191 Ill. 2d 238, 739 N.E.2d 45 (2000). While less stringent than the criminal standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, clear and convincing evidence requires a high degree of certainty, and a firm and abiding belief that it is highly probable that the proposition at issue is true. In re Czarnik, 2016PR00131, M.R. 29949 (Sept. 16, 2019).

There is no presumption in favor of reinstatement, and the mere passage of time is not a sufficient basis for granting the petition. Richman, 191 Ill. 2d at 247-48. The objectives in a reinstatement matter are to safeguard the public, maintain the integrity of the profession, and protect the administration of justice from reproach. In re Gonzales, 2013PR00003, M.R. 25825 (Mar. 12, 2015).

The focus of this proceeding is on Petitioner's rehabilitation, good character, and current knowledge of the law, with rehabilitation being the most important consideration. In re Hayes, 2018PR00090, M.R. 29589 (Nov. 19, 2019). In assessing whether reinstatement is warranted, we consider the following factors as well as any additional factors we deem appropriate: 1) the nature of the misconduct for which Petitioner was disciplined; 2) Petitioner's maturity and experience at

the time discipline was imposed; 3) whether Petitioner recognizes the nature and seriousness of the misconduct; 4) when applicable, whether Petitioner has made restitution; 5) Petitioner's conduct since discipline was imposed; and 6) Petitioner's candor and forthrightness in presenting evidence in support of the petition. Ill. S.Ct. R. 767(f).

### Background

Petitioner was licensed to practice law in Illinois in 1996. After receiving his license, he worked for the Illinois Attorney General for three years. (Tr. 98-99). He then worked for a short time for Hinshaw & Culbertson but found the billing expectations unmanageable and was asked to leave the firm. (Tr. 100). For the next four years, he worked as a sole practitioner and as an associate at Romanucci & Blandin, handling plaintiff's personal injury matters. He was let go from Romanucci & Blandin after he failed to file a case before the statute of limitations passed. (Tr. 102-103).

Petitioner and his wife then moved to Springfield, where Petitioner's family lived. Petitioner's father, the Hon. Richard H. Mills, is an attorney and retired United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois. Petitioner began working as a Sangamon County Assistant State's Attorney on February 1, 2005. (Tr. 104). At this time, Petitioner was having marital difficulties and was self-medicating with marijuana, alcohol, and cocaine. (Tr. 105). He was using a gram of cocaine per month with his wife and with another Assistant State's Attorney. (Tr. 74-76).

In January 2006, the Sangamon County State's Attorney was informed of a federal investigation into Petitioner's drug activities. Petitioner was given the choice of resigning or being fired, so he resigned. (Tr. 110). Petitioner and his wife divorced in 2006. (Tr. 113).

The Administrator filed a Complaint against Petitioner on February 6, 2007, and the matter went to hearing. The Hearing Board recommended that Petitioner be suspended for two years and until further of the Court, finding that he was not fully candid, did not understand the seriousness of his misconduct, and failed to show remorse. Mills, 07 SH 02 (Hearing Bd. at 25-29). The Review Board also recommended that Petitioner be suspended for two years and until further order of the Court. Mills, 07 SH 02 (Review Bd. at 3). Petitioner and the Administrator subsequently entered into an agreement for discipline on consent with the same sanction recommended by the Hearing and Review Boards. The Court allowed the petition to impose discipline on consent and suspended Petitioner for two years and until further order of the Court. In re Mills, M.R. 23070 (May 18, 2009).

**I. Petitioner’s misconduct was serious but does not bar reinstatement.**

A. Evidence Considered

While employed as an Assistant State’s Attorney, Petitioner purchased and used cocaine and cannabis on multiple occasions between February 2005 and January 2006. He was given immunity from prosecution in exchange for his cooperation in prosecuting other individuals. (Tr. 12). Petitioner admits he committed the drug offenses and recognizes they were grave misconduct that harmed the State’s Attorney’s office and the legal profession. (Tr. 132).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Although Petitioner avoided prosecution by cooperating with federal authorities, he acknowledges that he violated the law by using cocaine and cannabis on numerous occasions. His serious misconduct is aggravated by the fact that he committed it while employed as an Assistant State’s Attorney. See In re Parker, 149 Ill. 2d 222, 234, 595 N.E.2d 549 (1992). We consider in Petitioner’s favor, though, that he cooperated with federal authorities and assisted in the investigation of other individuals. We further note that attorneys whose misconduct was related

to their drug and/or alcohol use have been reinstated after demonstrating that they achieved and maintained sobriety. Parker, 149 Ill. 2d 222 (1992); In re Prusak, 2017PR00042, M.R. 028736 (Jan. 17, 2020); In re Reese, 2010PR00092, M.R. 24012 (March 19, 2012). Consequently, we find the nature of Petitioner’s misconduct to be serious but not so egregious as to preclude reinstatement.

## **II. Petitioner’s misconduct did not result from inexperience or immaturity.**

### A. Evidence Considered

Petitioner was 38 years old and had been practicing law for nine years at the time of his misconduct. (Tr. 122)

### B. Analysis and Conclusions

Petitioner was sufficiently mature and experienced to know he was engaging in misconduct and admits he knew he was acting illegally. Moreover, neither age nor experience was necessary to appreciate the wrongfulness of Petitioner’s conduct. See Gonzales, 2013PR00003. This factor does not favor Petitioner but is not determinative of whether reinstatement is appropriate. See In re Neopl, 09 RT 3002, M.R. 22990 (Sept. 20, 2011) (Hearing Bd. at 12-13). We also consider that Petitioner was suffering from addiction and mental health issues at the time of the misconduct.

## **III. Petitioner demonstrated that he fully accepts the nature and seriousness of his misconduct.**

### A. Evidence Considered

Petitioner admits he knew while he was using cocaine and cannabis that his conduct was “illegal, immoral, and wrong.” He takes full responsibility for his actions. (Tr. 132).

Petitioner acknowledges that he was not cooperative during his disciplinary hearing because he was arrogant, defensive and “didn’t get it.” He had not yet come to accept that his disciplinary matter was the result of his own “terrible decisions.” (Tr. 114-115). He now realizes

that his conduct harmed the State's Attorney's office and the legal profession, and he believes the Hearing Board was correct in its recommendation of discipline. (Tr. 125-28).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Whether a petitioner recognizes the nature and seriousness of past misconduct is an important factor in assessing whether reinstatement is warranted. In re Sosman, 2012PR00150, M.R. 25693 (Sept. 12, 2014). Expressions of remorse and acknowledgements of wrongdoing may establish this factor. In re Wexler, 2017PR00071, M.R. 28878 (March 16, 2021).

We find that Petitioner genuinely accepts and understands the nature and seriousness of his misconduct. His attitude and perspective have changed significantly in this regard since his disciplinary hearing. Accordingly, we find that this factor weighs in Petitioner's favor.

**IV. Petitioner has made all required restitution.**

A. Admitted Facts and Evidence Considered

Petitioner does not owe any restitution. (Adm. Resp. to Pet. for Reinstmt. at 3).

B. Analysis and Conclusions

Petitioner has satisfied this requirement.

**V. Petitioner established that his conduct since discipline was imposed supports reinstatement.**

A. Evidence Considered

We consider the evidence set forth in previous sections in addition to the following evidence.

Mental Health and Sobriety

Petitioner received in-patient treatment for his substance use after he was let go by the State's Attorney. In 2006 or 2007 he began seeing psychiatrist David Resch, M.D., who diagnosed Petitioner with cocaine dependence, marijuana dependence, alcohol dependence, and bipolar

disorder. Dr. Resch prescribed medication, but it took several years to find medications that were effective. (Tr. 120).

While Respondent was on disciplinary probation, he did not use illegal drugs. However, as soon as his probation ended in late 2009, he traveled to Amsterdam and used drugs. After this relapse, Petitioner came to the realization that his “addict mentality” was only hurting him. He decided to regain control of his life. The trip to Amsterdam was the last time Petitioner used cocaine. (Tr. 116-18).

Since October 2016, Petitioner has been a patient of Jeffrey Bennett, M.D., Associate Professor in psychiatry at the University of Illinois College of Medicine. (Tr. 17-18). When Dr. Bennett began working with Petitioner, he was in full sustained remission from his cocaine addiction and his alcohol dependence. His bipolar disorder was being treated with mood stabilizing medications, which have not changed. Petitioner has been stable during his treatment with Dr. Bennett, without episodes of mania. (Tr. 24). He experiences anxiety from time to time, which is treated episodically with medication. (Tr. 21).

Dr. Bennett has been impressed with Petitioner’s resilience and ability to handle stressful situations. After Petitioner’s mother died unexpectedly in July 2020, Petitioner went through a period of bereavement but did not develop a serious episode of depression. (Tr. 24). Dr. Bennett believes Petitioner is able to handle the normal stresses of life and work. (Tr. 29).

In Dr. Bennett’s opinion, Petitioner’s prognosis is good. He is compliant with attending office visits, taking his medication, and undergoing laboratory testing. Dr. Bennett sees Petitioner every two to three months. (Tr. 25-26). He has not asked Petitioner to submit to toxicological testing for cocaine, marijuana, or alcohol because he has not seen a need for such testing. Petitioner



has signed a Controlled Substances Agreement that forbids him from using any illegal substances. (Tr. 27).

Dr. Bennett expects for Petitioner to continue with the same treatment plan for the indefinite future. (Tr. 28-29). He believes it would be reasonable for Petitioner to participate in a peer support group such as Alcoholics Anonymous if Petitioner feels it would be helpful. In Dr. Bennett's view, Petitioner has done well without participating in that type of group. (Tr. 31-32). He does not believe random urinalysis screening would be necessary as a condition of reinstatement, but he believes Petitioner would comply with that condition if imposed. (Tr. 33).

At the Administrator's request, Petitioner submitted to an examination in February 2022 by forensic psychiatrist Ryan Finkenbine, M.D. Dr. Finkenbine opined that Petitioner's cocaine use disorder is in sustained remission. He further opined that Petitioner's risk of relapse is low, and his cocaine use disorder does not significantly impact his ability to practice as an attorney. Dr. Finkenbine was unable to confirm the diagnosis of bipolar disorder based on his interview, but opined that if bipolar disorder is present, it is being treated with medication and is unlikely to significantly affect Petitioner's practice. (Pet. Ex. 2). Dr. Bennett agrees with Dr. Finkenbine's conclusions and opinions regarding Petitioner's fitness to practice law. (Tr. 22).

Petitioner recognizes that he is "an addict for life," and can never use drugs. (Tr. 128). The stability he has achieved with his medication has allowed him to feel "normal," so he does not need to resort to using drugs. He no longer has contact with former friends who used drugs. (Tr. 129-130). He is willing to comply with any conditions related to maintaining his mental health and sobriety. (Tr. 136-38).

### Employment and Finances

After Petitioner lost his job as an Assistant State's Attorney, he had to sell his home and move in with his parents. He lived with them for three years while he was unable to find steady employment. (Tr. 121).

In 2013 and 2014, Petitioner completed a 600-hour internship with the Sangamon Water Reclamation District. He accepted full-time employment in July 2014 as a janitor, and has since received promotions to laborer, relief operator, and his current position of operator. He enjoys the scientific aspects of his job and the important role his facility plays in the community. (Tr. 122-24).

Petitioner earns \$75,000 per year. He is now financially stable and has purchased a home. He is eligible to retire from the Water Reclamation District on September 1, 2022, and will receive a pension. (Tr. 130).

### Character Testimony

Petitioner's colleagues at the Water Reclamation District testified to Petitioner's good character. Stephen Sanderfield, the Assistant Operations Supervisor, described Petitioner as a "great operator" with no disciplinary or attendance issues. Sanderfield further testified that Petitioner is trustworthy, detail-oriented, helpful, and takes pride in his work. He comes to work early and is proactive in addressing any potential problems. He is calm and reserved, even in stressful situations. (Tr. 42-48).

Sanderfield testified that the facility employees are subject to random alcohol and drug testing, and he has been trained to look for signs of drug and alcohol use. Petitioner has not failed any substance test, nor has Sanderfield seen any sign that Petitioner was under the influence of drugs or alcohol. (Tr. 48).

Jeffrey Feuer, an Operations Manager and Petitioner's supervisor, described Petitioner as very reliable, thorough, and smart. He trusts Petitioner to do his work with little supervision. He has had no reason to suspect that Petitioner was under the influence of drugs or alcohol. (Tr. 55-61).

Petitioner's father, Judge Mills, has observed "a total 100 percent complete reversal" in Petitioner's mood and ability to manage his life since he started working for the Water Reclamation District. (Tr. 84). Their relationship had been strained following Petitioner's suspension, but it is now excellent. They see each other twice a week and go on trips together. (Tr. 86).

### C. Analysis and Conclusions

Rehabilitation involves a return to a beneficial, constructive, and trustworthy role in society. In re Wigoda, 77 Ill. 2d 154, 159, 395 N.E.2d 571 (1979). Petitioner's activity since discipline was imposed, including matters such as employment, charitable or volunteer work, and overall responsibility, provides insight into these issues. Wexler, 2017PR00071 (Hearing Bd. at 16). Character evidence is also relevant. Id. We find that Petitioner's conduct since discipline was imposed supports reinstatement.

Petitioner is to be commended for his efforts in rehabilitating himself. Most importantly, he has maintained sobriety for over 12 years and has been consistent in obtaining mental health treatment and complying with his physician's recommendations. The opinions of Dr. Bennett and Dr. Finkenbine satisfy us that Petitioner's substance use disorders are in sustained remission, and there is no mental health reason that would inhibit his ability to practice law.

The evidence pertaining to Petitioner's employment at the Water Reclamation District further supports our determination that he has returned to a constructive and trustworthy role. We find credible the testimony of Petitioner's co-workers that he has been an exemplary and valued employee since 2014.

In addition, we found Judge Mills' description of how Petitioner has turned his life around to be particularly impactful. Having witnessed the high and low periods of Petitioner's life, we find credible Judge Mills' testimony that Petitioner has made significant changes and regained the stability he previously lost. Accordingly, for all of the foregoing reasons, we find that Petitioner's conduct since discipline was imposed supports reinstatement.

## **VI. Petitioner was candid and forthright in presenting his petition.**

### **A. Admitted Facts and Evidence Considered**

We consider the evidence set forth in the previous sections in addition to the following evidence.

In responding to the Petition for Reinstatement, the Administrator stated that his investigation did not reveal any areas of concern as to Petitioner's candor. (Adm. Resp. at 4).

### **Analysis and Conclusions**

In presenting a petition for reinstatement, an attorney is expected to act with a high level of care, candor, and judgment. In re Howard, 2010PR00067, M.R. 23910 (Sept. 25, 2013). This obligation encompasses both the written petition and the petitioner's testimony. See In re Salem, 2019PR00035, M.R. 029861 (Sept. 23, 2021) (Hearing Bd. at 26). We find that Petitioner has been forthright and open in his testimony and presentation of his Petition. Accordingly, this factor weighs in Petitioner's favor.

## **VII. Petitioner's plans if reinstated.**

### **A. Evidence Considered**

If reinstated, Petitioner would like to work in the area of personal injury law. Until he feels ready to represent clients on his own, he would refer clients to other attorneys and act as co-counsel or second chair. He recognizes that he will need to do "a lot of studying" to get up to speed. After

he retires from the Water Reclamation District, he will have ample time to devote to continuing legal education. (Tr. 134).

#### B. Analysis and Conclusions

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 767(f), we may consider any other factors that we deem appropriate. In the interest of protecting the public and the profession, we find it appropriate to consider Petitioner's plans for returning to practice if reinstated.

Petitioner's intention to handle personal injury matters if reinstated does not cause us concern. Although he testified that he was let go from a previous employment for allowing a statute of limitations to expire without filing a cause of action, Petitioner was struggling with untreated mental health and addiction issues when that occurred. Now that Petitioner's life has stabilized and he recognizes the need to work with other attorneys until he acclimates to practicing law, we have confidence that he can return to practice without presenting a risk to clients. In addition, because it has been approximately fifteen years since he last practiced law, we believe a period of mentorship would be warranted to assist Petitioner if reinstated and to provide an additional measure of protection to the public and the profession.

#### RECOMMENDATION

In a reinstatement proceeding, the focus is on the petitioner's rehabilitation and character, with rehabilitation being the most important factor. In re Martinez-Fraticelli, 221 Ill. 2d 255, 850 N.E.2d 155 (2006). Our objective, as in disciplinary proceedings, is to safeguard the public, maintain the integrity of the profession, and protect the administration of justice from reproach. In re Berkley, 96 Ill. 2d 404, 410, 451 N.E.2d 848 (1983).

Having considered all of the relevant factors, we find that Petitioner established his rehabilitation and good character by clear and convincing evidence. He obtained treatment for the mental health and addiction issues that led to his suspension, is in sustained remission, and has no

mental health impairment that would prevent him from practicing law ethically and competently. We find that Petitioner understands the importance of remaining abstinent and continuing treatment. The testimony of Petitioner's character witnesses further demonstrate that Petitioner has returned to a beneficial, constructive, and trustworthy role, and is able to handle the stresses of work and life without relapsing.

The Administrator does not oppose the Petition for Reinstatement but asks that any reinstatement recommendation be conditioned upon certain obligations in place for at least two years. In the interest of protecting the public, it is appropriate to recommend conditional reinstatement when certain circumstances, such as a lengthy absence from the practice of law and a history of substance abuse, are present. See In re Hildebrand, 2015PR00015, M.R. 27265 (Sept. 22, 2016). We agree with the Administrator that conditions addressing Petitioner's continued sobriety and mental health treatment and oversight of his practice would benefit Petitioner and protect the public and the profession while he reacclimates to practicing law.

We note that evidence of Petitioner's current knowledge of the law is lacking, but that absence is not fatal to his Petition when the evidence otherwise supports reinstatement. See In re Kipnis, 2012PR00142, M.R. 25660 (Nov. 20, 2013) ((Hearing Bd. at 10). Petitioner's knowledge of the law can be satisfactorily addressed by the requirement in Supreme Court Rule 791(f) that he earn a certain amount of Mandatory Continuing Legal Education credit within one year of the entry of the order of reinstatement and by conditioning reinstatement upon working for a period of time under the supervision of a mentor.

Having carefully considered the relevant evidence and the factors set forth in Rule 767, we recommend that Daniel Cass Mills be reinstated to the practice of law subject to the following

conditions, which will remain in effect for the first two (2) years after entry of the Court's final order:

- a. Petitioner shall comply with Article VII of the Illinois Supreme Court Rules on Admission and Discipline of Attorneys and the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct and shall timely cooperate with the Administrator in providing information regarding any investigations relating to his conduct;
- b. Petitioner, upon reinstatement, shall comply, or document that he has complied, with the Minimum Continuing Legal Education requirements for reinstated attorneys set out in Supreme Court Rule 791(f);
- c. Petitioner shall attend meetings as scheduled by the Commission probation officer. He shall submit quarterly written reports to the Commission probation officer concerning the status of his practice of law and the nature and extent of his compliance with the conditions of his reinstatement;
- d. Petitioner shall notify the Administrator within fourteen (14) days of any change of address;
- e. Petitioner shall abstain from using alcohol, cannabis, and any unprescribed controlled substance. He shall report to the Administrator any lapse in his sobriety or usage of any unprescribed controlled substances, alcohol, or cannabis within seventy-two (72) hours of that usage;
- f. Petitioner shall, as required by the Administrator, submit to random substance testing by a qualified mental health professional or facility approved by the Administrator within eight (8) hours of receiving notice from the Administrator that he shall submit to the testing. The results of the tests shall be reported to the Administrator. Petitioner shall pay all costs of such testing;
- g. Petitioner shall engage in a course of individual therapy on a monthly basis with a licensed mental health provider. Petitioner shall authorize the mental health provider to communicate with the Administrator in writing no less than every three (3) months regarding Petitioner's participation and progress. Sessions may occur by phone or video conferencing;
- h. Petitioner shall continue treatment with Dr. Bennett or a qualified psychiatrist acceptable to the Administrator, with the Administrator advised of any change in attendance deemed warranted by such professional. Petitioner shall comply with all treatment recommendations, including scheduled sessions and the taking of medications as prescribed. Sessions may occur by phone or video conferencing;
- i. Petitioner shall provide the Administrator and Dr. Bennett or other approved psychiatrist with an appropriate release authorizing him or her to (1) disclose to the Administrator, on at least a quarterly basis, information pertaining to the

- nature of Petitioner's compliance with any treatment plan established with respect to Petitioner's condition; (2) promptly report to the Administrator Petitioner's failure to comply with any part of an established treatment plan; and (3) respond to any inquiries by the Administrator regarding Petitioner's treatment and compliance with any established treatment plan;
- j. Upon return to practice, Petitioner shall be supervised by a licensed attorney approved by the Administrator. Petitioner shall notify the Administrator of the names and addresses of any and all attorneys with whom he establishes a supervisory relationship and shall provide notice to the Administrator of any change in supervising attorneys within fourteen days of the change. Petitioner shall authorize the supervising attorney to meet with a representative of the Administrator and work out a supervision plan, which shall include the attorney meeting with Petitioner on a weekly basis and the attorney submitting a quarterly written report to the Administrator regarding the nature of Petitioner's practice, the number of cases being handled by Petitioner, and the attorney's general appraisal of Petitioner's continued fitness to practice. Meetings may occur by phone or video conferencing;
  - k. Petitioner shall promptly report any violation of the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct; and
  - l. If Petitioner is found to have violated any of the conditions of reinstatement, his conditional reinstatement shall be revoked and he shall be suspended from the practice of law until further order of the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Sonni Choi Williams  
Laura K. Beasley  
Daniel G. Samo

### **CERTIFICATION**

I, Michelle M. Thome, Clerk of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois and keeper of the records, hereby certifies that the foregoing is a true copy of the Report and Recommendation of the Hearing Board, approved by each Panel member, entered in the above entitled cause of record filed in my office on December 2, 2022.

/s/ Michelle M. Thome  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle M. Thome, Clerk of the  
Attorney Registration and Disciplinary  
Commission of the Supreme Court of Illinois